



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.            | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/707,156                 | 11/06/2000  | Vivian A. Schramm    | MRS-015U            | 8663             |
| 99217                      | 7590        | 07/24/2012           |                     |                  |
| Schramm-Personal: Complete |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Michael R. Schramm         |             |                      | BEKKER, KELLY JO    |                  |
| 350 West 2000 South        |             |                      |                     |                  |
| Perry, UT 84302            |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                            |             |                      | 1781                |                  |
|                            |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                            |             |                      | 07/24/2012          | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Advisory Action</b><br><b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/707,156<br><br><b>Examiner</b><br>KELLY BEKKER | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>SCHRAMM ET AL.<br><br><b>Art Unit</b><br>1781 |
|---|---|--|

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
 THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2012 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  
NO NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection. No Notice of Appeal has been filed. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114 if this is a utility or plant application. Note that RCEs are not permitted in design applications. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action; or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

c) ☐ A prior Advisory Action was mailed more than 3 months after the mailing date of the final rejection in response to a first after-final reply filed within 2 months of the mailing date of the final rejection. The current period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the prior Advisory Action or SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is earlier.

*Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a), (b) or (c). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THIS ADVISORY ACTION IS THE FIRST RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S FIRST AFTER-FINAL REPLY WHICH WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. ONLY CHECK BOX (c) IN THE LIMITED SITUATION SET FORTH UNDER BOX (c). See MPEP 706.07(f).*

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) or (c) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 02 July 2012. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendments filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): (a) ☐ will not be entered, or (b) ☐ will be entered, and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing the Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☒ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See continuation sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

STATUS OF CLAIMS

14. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 27-46.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | /Kelly Bekker /<br>Primary Examiner<br>Art Unit: 1781 |
|--|---|

Cont. 10 and 11:

Applicant argues that the previous office action should be withdrawn as the Office Action Summary (shown in the evidence entered) had both the non-final and final box checked and thus it was unclear as to the status of the action. Applicant argument is not convincing. Although a typographical error was made on the Office Action Summary, the body of the Office Action, specifically, under the Conclusion stated that the Office Action was final as well as reasons as to why such finality was appropriate.

Applicant argues that the claims are new claims and thus should not have been finally rejected. As stated in the Office Action, the claims were finally rejected as they could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record if they had been earlier presented.

Applicant argues that the instant application claims priority and therefore the references, specifically, Schramm US 5,246,046 does not apply. Applicant's argument is not convincing.

(1) Such priority has not been claimed. The application data sheet filed by applicant on October 25, 2011 which recites priority was not properly signed. Additionally, the specification clearly states that priority is not claimed. It is noted that an amendment to the specification was made October 25, 2011. While this amendment adds a listed paragraph, it does not delete the previously recited paragraph which clearly states that no priority is claimed.

(2) Even if properly claimed, the related applications are Continuations-in-part and do not support the instant claim language of a container for a lollipop and/or candy. Therefore the claims would not be given such priority.

(3) The reference argued by applicant was simply relied upon as an evidentiary reference and the rejection does not depend on the reference.

Applicant argues that Klein, Roberts, O'Conner, and Kirkman are non-analogous art. Again, it is noted that such references were relied upon only as evidence and as such the rejection does not depend on the references.